Why Blacks Despair, P. 2

Even Wall Street Lawyers Being Radicalized

"We can't abolish poverty . . . racial inequality . . . inflation or pollution overnight. But we can't start on any of them unless there is an end to the war in Southeast Asia."—*Francis T. P. Plimpton, president of the Association of the Bar of New York, who led the "march" of Wall Street lawyers on Washington last week to lobby for peace.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, NO. 11 JUNE 1, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Nixon, Agnew and Freedom of The Press

The next time Nixon holds a press conference some reporter * should ask him just where he now stands on the question of freedom of speech and press in wartime. The Vice President's renewed attack on selected newspapers and newspapermen makes the question timely. In 1965, after Johnson first sent combat troops into Vietnam, Nixon in a letter to the *New York Times* (Oct. 29, 1965) advocated restriction of speech and press in wartime. He took issue with Robert Kennedy for defending the right of dissent in the case of Professor Eugene Genovese of Rutgers. Genovese had said that while he deplored the loss of American lives he welcomed the political victory of the Vietcong. Nixon's letter deserves a careful re-reading now in the light of Agnew's campaign against the media.

Even Lyndon Never Went That Far

In the first place the letter reveals what can only be described as a very overwrought view of what is at stake in the Vietnam war. He wrote that victory for the Vietcong "would mean ultimately the destruction of freedom of speech for all time not only in Asia but in the United States as well", indeed that "if the war in Vietnam is lost . . . the right of free speech will be extinguished throughout the world." Even Lyndon never claimed that much. Against that apocalyptic background Nixon saw a conflict between the government's responsibility to protect the individual's right to free speech and its responsibility "to defend itself against enemies whose victory would deny freedom of speech to all." Nixon was for firing Professor Genovese as an employee of a State university, though he was not at that time for curtailing the freedom of peace demonstrators "and those participating in teach-ins" as long as they were "acting in an individual and private capacity." But as a general proposition he advocated restriction when necessary. He wrote—

America's twentieth century war Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, were forced to make this cruel choice and in both instances they properly concluded that in wartime preservation of freedom for all the people must take precedence over the rights of an individual to exercise freedom of speech when it would serve the enemies of freedom.

But what of those who believe the enemies of freedom are benefiting from our stubborn folly in bogging down American military power in a land war in Asia, ruining our economy and tearing the country apart in a conflict which bears little relation to America's real interests? What of those who think freedom of speech and press give a free society the advantage of open debate as a means of correcting a disastrous course?

Hedging On Withdrawal

Q. And you say that the United States will get its combat troops completely out of Vietnam by mid-1971?

A. I said we'd get our troops *out of combat* in South Vietnam. Now, we have made it clear all the time that there will have to be some combat troops remaining to function with the support of elements that are left, but the objective is to get American troops *out of the combat role* in about a year . . . [Italics added.]

Q. Mr. Secretary, on this mid-1971 target date for getting out of combat, as I understand it that would leave 250,000, roughly, of American troops in South Vietnam.

A. It might be a little bit more than that. I'm not sure. I think the mathematics are something like 280,000 or 275,000, something like that.

Q. What's the target date for getting all out? That's what the young people are asking now.

A. Well, we haven't announced any target date for that . . .

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you state with fair confidence, or good confidence, that American troops will continue to be withdrawn from South Vietnam after 1971?

A. I don't want to comment on what is going to happen after 1971.

—Secretary of State Rogers, press conference, May 13.

Nixon's simple-minded approach recalls his reasoning 22 years ago when he first introduced the Mundt-Nixon bill to set up the Subversive Activities Control Board. Then, too, he justified restriction of liberty as a means of defending it. This is the standard alibi of totalitarians, Communist and anti-Communist. Have similar restrictions been discussed lately within the Nixon official family? Could this perhaps explain why Nixon's new Chief Justice Warren Burger took the occasion of an address before the American Law Institute May 19 to take issue with those who "say that we must 'crack down,' that we must 'smash' the challengers and restore tight discipline?" "In periods of stress," the Chief Justice counselled, "there are always some voices raised urging that we suspend fundamental guarantees and take short cuts as a method of self-protection. But this is not our way of doing things short of a great national emergency." What did the Chief Justice hear that led him to deliver that warning?

If criticism of the war is to be equated with disloyalty, the Administration will find itself confronted with a far wider spectrum of dissent than the half dozen notorious publications Agnew singled out in his $500 blueplate special at Houston. My paper and *Life*, the *New Republic* and the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* and the "leftist" *Arkansas Gazette* are hardly exceptional any more. There is John S. Knight, pub-

(Continued on Page Four)

*** Newsletters do not qualify for White House credentials so when I go to a Presidential press conference it is only as a guest with no right to ask questions.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Will Nixon's Top Black Officials Walk Out In Protest . . . ?

IF WE WERE BLACK, we would be filled with a bottomless despair. The events of the past two weeks show the essential indifference if not downright hostility of the white majority in this country. The killing of six blacks, all shot in the back, in Augusta, and the murderous fusillade against a black women's dormitory in Jackson, Miss., where two girls were killed, have elicited little protest in the white community and very little reaction even among blacks, accustomed to such brutality. The President's skimpy message of protest was amazingly frigid and extraordinarily non-committal. The Attorney General went South but to a lily-white upper class Delta Council meeting where he discussed the stock market! "Since he became Attorney General," Aaron Henry said bitterly in a story on that appearance which the *Washington Star* yanked after its early edition May 20, "he has done more than any one man to create the climate that makes white policemen feel they can shoot our people down, like they did at Jackson State."

Police Perjury and Murder

A Chicago grand jury reports police perjury and wilful murder in the Black Panther raid which killed Fred Hampton and Mark Clark but could find no evidence on which to indict! "Few things would contribute more to bring us together," Samuel C. Jackson, black assistant secretary of housing and urban development said in a speech to whites here May 22, "than the growth of law and order among the forces of law and order." Agnew and Mitchell were his obvious targets and he had sharp words to say of the Administration's D.C. crime bill with its "no-knock" and pre-trial detention provisions. But he stays in the Nixon Administration. The last straw for Nixon's black officials should be his decision to support tax exemption for segregated white schools in the South. If James Farmer, Assistant HEW Secretary, and the other top blacks in Nixon's entourage had any guts they would stage a mass resignation in protest.

WE CANNOT PROVE IT BUT WE BELIEVE THE WHITE HOUSE put a media blackout on Richard Barnet's warnings at a Businessmen Move for Vietnam Peace meeting here May 20 against the danger that Nixon might escalate to nuclear weapons. It was covered by all the networks and the wire services. An AP story was prepared but never went on the wires and except for a brief mention on local radio that was the last anyone heard of the story. Barnet, a former State Department man now with the Institute for Policy Studies, reported (1) as early as 1963 there were more than 5,500 nuclear weapons in Southeast Asia, mostly on carriers, some in Thailand; (2) until 1965 the Commander in Chief Pacific (CINPAC) had no plans for large-scale though limited war which were not nuclear and the doctrine for such use of nuclear weapons was set forth in an *Air University Review* article in 1960; (3) Nixon in a Chicago speech March 17, 1955 termed tactical nuclear weapons conventional and said it was "foolish" to think we would fight in the Far East without using them; (4) Nixon in his May 8 press conference this year hinted at "decisive" rather than piece-meal escalation in the event of major enemy action; (5) twice before the U.S. military urged the use of nuclear weapons in Indochina, once at Dienbienphu ("Operation Vulture") and again to relieve the garrison at Khe San in 1968 but strong opposition behind the scenes from Congressional and scientific sources stopped it; (6) as U.S. troops are reduced in Vietnam, the use of nuclear weapons may be advocated as a way "to save

Laird to The Rescue

SEN. FULBRIGHT: Has your opinion been requested with regard to the deployment of MIRV, has anybody consulted you about that?

FOSTER [director of Pentagon research and development]: Yes, sir.

FULBRIGHT: Have you recommended it be deployed?

FOSTER: Yes, sir.

FULBRIGHT: And your judgment is that this will not effect the SALT talks, the deployment of MIRVs?

FOSTER: My judgment is, sir, that they will effect the SALT talks and that they will help the U.S. position in the SALT talks . . .

FULBRIGHT: Do you know, can you name one well-known physicist, scientist, in this general area who agrees with your estimate of the effect of the deployment of MIRV on SALT talks?

SEC. LAIRD: I think the question is one that I am not sure Dr. Foster has even directed such a questionnaire to the scientific community . . . [Laird even argued at length that it would have been unethical for the Department of Defense to have taken such a poll.]

FULBRIGHT: Now, now, Mr. Secretary, you know you should not get so excited just because he is in a tight spot and cannot think of one, you want to divert his attention from it. [LAUGHTER]

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 18.

The Black Caucus in Congress Protests Nixon's Indifference to "The Black Nation"

For more than 90 days the nine black Members of the House of Representatives have been trying to arrange a meeting with the President. On February 18, 1970, we wrote Mr. Nixon requesting an audience. The members of the black caucus make known at this time our outright disgust with the President's policies and his refusal to give us an audience. In a letter dated April 20, Mr. Nixon informed us through his staff assistant, "We had hoped to be able to work this out, but the President's schedule has been such that we just have not been able to work it in. At this point, we do not foresee an opportunity in the immediate future, but will be back in touch with you if an appropriate time arises."

During this 90-day interval, our President who claimed he wanted to "bring us together" found time to meet with representatives of 11 veterans and patriotic groups to discuss foreign policy. There is no question where Mr. Nixon has placed his priorities. He has traveled more than 35,000 miles in foreign countries. He has entertained hundreds of foreign diplomats but refuses to meet with the elected representatives of the black "nation" within this country. In all of the President's travels he has not seen the suffering and deprivation in Watts, Hough, Harlem, Fillmore or any of the other ghettos.

The black citizens of the United States constitute by their very numbers and condition one of the largest "underdeveloped" nations in the world. The President, despite his pledge to serve all the people of this country, has ignored his responsibility to our people. The President's position on the Voting Rights Act extension and on school desegregation, his Supreme Court nominations of two southern racists, his veto of Federal education funds, and his refusal to place a priority on the domestic concerns of hunger, housing, poverty, and employment testify to his apathy not only toward black people—but toward all poor Americans.

The President has declared his disdain for military defeat and his passion for honor among the world community. If there is honor to be won, it is here in this country where American blood is staining American soil. Six murdered in Augusta and two in Jackson.

—Rep. Clay (D. Mo.) in the House May 18 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . New Escalation in Indochina Increases the Danger of War in the Mid-East

lives" (as in Hiroshima and Nagasaki). Congress should act now to inquire why nuclear weapons are in the Far East and require their removal. An anonymous White House official in a press briefing (*Washington Post* May 10) said nuclear weapons would not be used under any circumstances. But that was not the same as having Nixon say it clear and loud.

Diverting Chinese Pressure on Moscow

MIDDLE EAST FOOTNOTE: Gen. Gavin told Senate Foreign Relations May 12 the Soviets feel free to act in the Middle East because our escalation in Southeast Asia diverted Chinese pressure from the Soviet border. The situation in the Middle East can move us to the brink of World War III at any time. The terrible spiral of terrorism and reaction on the Lebanese border is a blind alley from which Jew and Arab alike can be rescued only by an imposed solution restoring the West Bank to the Arabs and guaranteeing Israel's existence in her pre-1967 borders with some security modifications. But the fear that the U.S. may soon bomb Hanoi and Haiphong again, making Moscow look like a paper tiger to its own satellites, has set back negotiations for a Four Power agreement. We are not for ending one war in order to leap into another but for de-escalation and negotiation in both areas.

THREE HOPEFUL DEVELOPMENTS: The tremendous outpouring of mail and contributions ($300,000 so far) in response to the "End the War" broadcast of May 12 by Senators McGovern, Hatfield, Goodell and Hughes and of support for Fulbright, Church and Cooper in their fight for a Congressional resolution to end the Cambodian adventure. The most startling development of all was the arrival here May 20 of a thousand or more New York lawyers to lobby against the war. When a legendary Republican Brahmin like Bruce Bromley of Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Wall Street's biggest corporate law firm, "marches" on Washington for peace and is joined here by Edward Burling of Acheson's law firm, Covington & Burling, the capitol's most prestigious law factory, a political earthquake is really underway. Conversely when Nixon set out to muster support for the Cambodian invasion, he had to fall back on the associations of reserve officers and of military-industrial suppliers. A secret meeting at the White House two nights before the April 30 speech to disclose the new escalation included only one representative of a "civilian" organization—the National Rifle Association! Neither the bankers, the bar nor the Chambers of Commerce could any longer be trusted for support. Senator Gore in a Senate speech May 21 put into the *Congressional Record* a letter from Vice Admiral Smedberg, of the Retired Officers' Association, disclosing the meeting and drumming up support for the invasion against "the strident minority . . . giving great comfort and aid to the enemy." The Air Force Association and the ultra-right National Security Council were among those present. In the civilian world only the weapons merchants are still "trustworthy" enough for an advance briefing. There could be no better index of how far opposition to the war has spread.

FROM THE AUTHOR OF THE QUIET AMERICAN: "To those who are ignorant of geography, Mr. Nixon's promise to withdraw his troops from Cambodia in seven weeks may seem to be a conciliatory gesture. But in fact he can do nothing else. Before the rains and the arrival of flooding of the Mekong they must either go or decide to act as pioneers in underwater living"—*Graham Greene in* The Times *(London) May 11.*

China Is Sanctuary and Arsenal Too

FULBRIGHT: Is it fair to conclude that in the Senator's view if the President decided next month or next year without consultation or approval of the Senate, that in order to protect the lives of our soldiers in Vietnam it was necessary to invade Laos and get at the sanctuaries there, such action would be perfectly proper?

STENNIS: That depends on circumstances somewhat, but I say as long as we are staying in Vietnam, sending men in there to sacrifice their lives, I will never agree to having the President cut off from using his judgment to attack the sanctuaries. They are no more a part of a foreign country than my backyard is at home, in view of the circumstances that they have been used as an arsenal against us for years, and they are not under the control of this foreign country. So we do not attack this other country; we attack the arsenal that is permitted to be used there, or maybe they cannot help themselves. We go after the arsenal.

FULBRIGHT: Then he could clearly attack China without consulting the Senate or the House. He could attack China on the same theory.

—On the Senate floor, May 15.

Fulbright: How Honduran Aid to Vietnam Was Faked And Turned Into a Costly Junket

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In 1967 the Department of State furnished me with detailed information concerning Free World assistance to Vietnam . . . In the list of countries which contributed assistance the statement is made: "Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Vietnam, flown there on a Honduran Air Force plane." A recent draft report by the General Accounting Office, "Administration and Effectiveness of United States Economic and Military Assistance to Honduras", makes the following statement: "Due to the limited range of Honduran Air Force cargo aircraft it was determined by United States authorities to use a USAF plane to transport the supplies from Tegucigalpa, Honduras, to Saigon, South Vietnam. The plane was flown from the Panama Canal Zone to Tegucigalpa, repainted with Honduran Air Force colors and with a United States navigator aboard made the trip to Saigon." If the GAO report is correct, then the Congress was clearly misled by the Department of State in 1967. Indeed, the whole operation smacks of a particularly offensive kind of fraud.

—J. W. Fulbright

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked that I reply to your letter of March 26 . . . As plans for the trip developed it became apparent that the aircraft was not equipped for a trans-Pacific flight . . . Under the circumstances, the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, authorized the loan of a USAF C–54 . . . This aircraft bore Honduran markings and was, in effect, an Honduran aircraft for the duration of the loan . . . With regard to your request that the loan and repainting of the aircraft be publicized, I feel this could only harm our relations with Honduras.

—H. G. Torbert, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary

After a stop of 5 days in Vietnam, the philanthropic party [there were 26 aboard] returned in even more leisurely fashion [it took 13 days from Honduras to Vietnam], taking 16 days from February 17 to March 5. For reasons which do not appear on the record, but which I think we can all guess, it was found desirable to return via a different route—one which naturally included Hong Kong. . . . The record does not disclose the cost of this pilgrimage, but I think we can take judicial notice that it undoubtedly exceeded the cost of supplies delivered to the Vietnamese.

—Fulbright to the Senate, May 6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Does Nixon Regard A Free Press As Just Another Enemy Sanctuary?

(Continued from Page One)

lisher of a major chain of newspapers, who called the Cambodian invasion "of questionable legality and dubious morality." There is the *Wall Street Journal* which termed it a poor gamble. There is Robert Shaplen of the *New Yorker*, who has been in Indochina longer than any American reporter and in the past has been second only to Joe Alsop in his support of U.S. intervention. He reports from Saigon that in view of the deteriorating political situation in South Vietnam, "the Cambodian adventure may well prove disastrous", that few observers in Saigon share Nixon's hope that it will shorten the war. On the contrary, Shaplen writes, "consistent misunderstanding and mismanagement . . . have now brought us to the highly dangerous point of withdrawing our troops and broadening our commitment—a script worthy of Lewis Carroll."

Even The New Leader Turns Anti-War

Even the *New Leader*, the one place on the left where Nixon could find support and sympathy in his Red-hunting days in the 50s, has defected. In an article by Roger Hilsman, written on the eve of the Cambodian invasion, it declares that Nixon's Vietnamization policy "represents a decision to continue the war, not to end it." Hilsman, who was one of the architects of intervention in Vietnam under Kennedy, now warns against "participation in a Cambodian offensive." If Nixon and Agnew are out to revive McCarthyism, the number and variety of those to be labelled subversive have grown fantastically. When I began publication in the heyday of McCarthyism 18 years ago I never dreamt that some day I would share the pillory with a Luce publication! In journalism at least Nixon has kept his pledge and brought us all together.

Even conservative and pro-war papers like the *Washington Star* regard Agnew with disfavor. It sees in his "verbal rabbit punches" a factor making for "a wide and dangerous polarization of opinion." It says "many who support the decision on Cambodia . . . have reacted with dismay to the Administration's handling of the predictable crisis that action precipitated on the home front." It deplores the creation of an atmosphere in which "more and more, those who disagree with a given opinion are looked upon not as countrymen with differing reasonable points of view but as the enemy." That illustrates what the *Wall Street Journal* was talking about the other day when it sad in an editorial, "Toward Conciliation," that "the Administration's thinking is tainted by a self-destructive belief: that the Administration is conservative, that the public has turned 'conservative' and that therefore the public will back the Administration come what may." It warned that "unless Administration planners treat the public as the complex and sensitive organism it is, they will only lose their very real chance for building sustained moral and political backing."

Such sober second thoughts seem to be beyond this Administration. Nixon and Agnew seem increasingly to regard a free press as another privileged sanctuary. Will their crusade for freedom in Asia finish by ending it at home? It is not too early to begin to ask the question. More and more, as anti-war dissent rises in every class and region, Nixon and Agnew are thrown back on an appeal to the Know Nothings of our time.

May 25

Editors Growing Nervous

As reaction to campus demonstrations grows in this country, employment opportunities for radicals and the not-so-radical have begun to narrow—especially in the area of summer jobs. Institutions as diverse as the federal government, the New York *Times* and Washington *Post* and New England prep schools are now asking direct and possibly illegal questions about a job applicant's political history . . . After taking in a fistful of radical interns last year, the Washington *Post* drew a hard line on political activists this year in response to Agnew-led attacks on the "liberal" press. "We're not sure we can afford to be hiring political activists any more," Ben Bagdikian, the *Post's* national editor reportedly told one intern applicant.

Both the *Post* and *Times* asked prospective summer interns a long series of prospective questions having little relation to reportorial skill in interviews this spring. Examples include: What was the last political demonstration you participated in? Would you serve in the Army? How do you plan to get out?

***Post* editors agonized over and finally rejected one student they considered eminently qualified after he answered that he would go to jail rather than serve in the army. Executive Editor Benjamin C. Bradlee reportedly argued that this level of commitment might hamper his journalistic objectivity. One editor later admitted that the person would have been hired had he answered differently.**

—Scott W. Jacobs, *The Harvard Crimson*, May 14.

The 1969 Index Is Now Ready—You Can Have A Copy Free By Sending A LONG Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope For It

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, **The Hidden History of The Korean War** (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 6/1/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED